

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Final Office Action mailed December 11, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-12 and 14-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burak et al. (US 2003/0176214) in view of Berkel and Clarke (Characterization & Optimization of 3D-LCD Module Design) (hereinafter called “Berkel”) among which claims 1, 14, 27, and 30 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Office Action contends that the elements of the presently claimed invention are disclosed in Burak except that “Burak fails to mention the number of perspective views that are achieved by the disclosure lenticular lens.” The Office Action further contends that Berkel teaches “the methodology for creating lenticular displays of higher than four perceptive views as an attempt to minimize the ‘blur’ between views and an increase between a horizontal and vertical resolution in each view” and that Berkel “illustrates to one having ordinary skill how to create a nine perspective view lenticular display.” The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons, among others, set forth below.

Burak teaches “a gaming machine having a persistence-of-vision (“POV”) display” to create true or virtual 3D imagery. (Paragraphs [0002]). Moreover, Burak teaches that cylindrical lenslets “create a horizontal parallax effect only. Another type of lenticular display, also called an integram, uses spherical lenslets instead of cylindrical ones to present horizontally and vertically varying directional information, thus producing a full parallax image.” (Paragraph [0132]). Thus, Burak teaches the use of spherical lenslets, rather than spherical lenslets, in order the create the 360° 3D image as the use of cylindrical lenslets would simply produce horizontal parallax effect only.

On the other hand, Berkel teaches a methodology of creating lenticular displays of higher than 4 perceptive views with the use of a cylindrical lenslets on a lenticular lens. (*See*, Section 2 and Figures 5 and 6). However, Berkel does not teach or mention or teach the use of spherical lenslets.

MPEP §2145.X.D.2. states: “References Cannot be Combined Where Reference Teaches Away from Their Combination.” In this case, Burak teaches the use of spherical lenslets as cylindrical lenslets would not create the desired optical effect; Berkel’s methodology utilizes lenticular lenses having cylindrical lenslets and simply would not optically work in Burak. Thus, Burak teaches against the proposed modification and combination with Berkel.

Furthermore, MPEP §2143.01 states: “The proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose”. In this case, Burak’s intent is to use spherical lenslets to present horizontally and vertically varying directional information and not simply a horizontal parallax effect. As taught by Burak, the cylindrical lenslet lenticular lens of Berkel would simply create a horizontal parallax effect and would not result in Burak’s desired 3D image. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed modification of the references would render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Accordingly, since the combination of references teach away from each other and the proposed modification would render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, it can not be said that the combination of Burak and Berkel renders the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to dependent claims 2-12 and 15-26, 28-29, and 31-32, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

### The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burak in view of Acres et al. (US 5,655,961). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 13 depends upon Claim 12. Thus, the arguments above would equally apply here. The base claim being allowable, the dependent claim must also be allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Request for Entry of Amendment

Entry of this Amendment will place the Application in better condition for allowance, or at the least, narrow any issues for an appeal. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P202).

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/  
Adrienne Yeung  
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001